

R.
203, 4824
am A-2

Methodological Problems of the Radio Diary
and Coincidental Interview Methods

Report No. A-2

Series No. 3

July 30, 1956

UNCLASSIFIED

RESEARCH STAFF

OFFICE OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS

AMERICAN EMBASSY

Methodological Problems of the Radio Diary
and Coincidental Interview Methods

Report No. A-2

Series No. 3

July 30, 1956

This report was prepared for the Research Staff by the
Institut fuer Sozial- und Wirtschaftsforschung, Bad Godesberg.

T A B L E O F C O N T E N T S

	<u>Page No.</u>
INTRODUCTION	i
<u>Part I - Description of the Radio Diary and Coincidental Interview Methods</u>	<u>1 - 14</u>
<u>Chapter 1: The Radio Diary Study</u>	<u>1 - 0</u>
<u>Section A. - General Description</u>	<u>1 - 2</u>
<u>Section B. - The Radio Diary Sample</u>	<u>2 - 6</u>
<u>Chapter 2: The Coincidental Interview Study.</u>	<u>6 - 14</u>
<u>Section A. - General Description</u>	<u>6 - 9</u>
<u>Section B. - The Coincidental Interview Sample</u>	<u>9 - 14</u>
<u>Part II - Comparison of the Diary and the Coincidental Method</u>	<u>15 - 31</u>
<u>Section A. - General Considerations</u>	<u>15</u>
<u>Section B. - Comparisons of Obtained Data</u>	<u>16 - 30</u>
1) Listeners and Non-Listeners	16 - 20
2) Listeners During the Test Quarter Hour	20 - 23
3) Radio Stations Heard	23 - 25
4) VOA and Non-VOA-Listeners	25 - 28
5) Conscious VOA Listening	29 - 30
<u>Section C. - Concluding Observations</u>	<u>30 - 31</u>
APPENDIX	32 - 33

I N T R O D U C T I O N

In the Fall of 1955, the Research Staff instituted its third radio diary study.

For the first time, however, two different survey techniques were employed simultaneously: the "radio diary" technique, and the "coincidental" interview technique. In the case of the radio diaries, the listeners interviewed were requested to record in a diary all the programs to which they listened during the week. When the coincidental technique was used the interviewees were visited during a definite time relevant to the survey. The interviewer himself noted whether the interviewee was listening to the radio and to what he was listening.

The study was carried out in West Germany and West Berlin and intended - as did the preceding inquiries - to serve the purpose of compiling information on listening habits in general, and to make available data on listening to the VOA and RIAS. The results of the queries asked were presented in Report No. 235, "The Radio Diary Study 1955," June 1956.

This same study furnished the data for the present report. Whereas hitherto the emphasis was placed on the results as such and indications as to the methods employed were restricted to some basic information, we will here be concerned with a comparison of the different methodologies- their application, their results, and their comparability.

A description of the diary technique as applied in the study as well as a description of the coincidental survey will be found in Part I. Comparisons between the two techniques are presented in Part II.

Part I - Description of the
Radio Diary and Coincidental Interview Methods

Chapter 1: The Radio Diary Study

Section A. - General Description

The diary survey was based on a two-stage systematic random sample representative of the West German population between the ages of 18 and 79.

The diary study was preceded by a preliminary survey, in which the interviewee was to indicate whether he listened to the radio and to what stations he listened. This took place in the week before October 3, 1955.* Interviewees who listened to the radio in their own home or in another home in the same house were asked to keep a radio diary in the following week, from October 3 to October 9.** Each radio listener was asked, "Here we have what is known as a radio diary. We kindly request that for the period of one week - namely from Monday, October 3 until Sunday October 9** - you record in it all of the programs that you will listen to on the radio. You have surely heard of such listeners surveys. And we hope that you won't mind the slight inconvenience which you undergo by filling in these forms. These surveys are intended to yield important material on which future programming will be based. May I leave this radio diary with you?"

Along with the diary the interviewees were given a reminder tag which, attached to the radio set, was to remind them of their task. At the same time they were informed that prizes could be won through a raffle which would come at the end. The raffle was planned as a special stimulus to insure completion of the diary.

In the diary the individual weekdays were divided into time periods of 15 minutes each. Each program heard for at least five minutes was to be noted in the proper time section in the diary, together with station identification, wave length and type of program. If more than one program was listened to during any 15 minute interval, only one program was to be listed, namely that which was listened to the longest. In order to avoid misunderstandings, the listener was given explanations and examples on the first pages of the diary. He was urged to remain faithful to his usual listening habits and should by no means listen to the radio more often during test week than he usually would. The introductory explanations will be found in the appendix to this report.

* In Berlin - in the week before October 17, 1955.

** In Berlin - October 17 to October 23.

The diaries were then collected by the interviewers during the week after the test week. The interviewers checked the entries, and inquired about unclear entries. At the same time they determined whether the interviewee had listened to the "Voice of America" during the test week. Those listeners who had tuned in to VOA were asked additional questions about the VOA. Identical questions were given to those listeners who during the test week had not listened to VOA, but who stated upon questioning that during the preceding four weeks they had listened to the VOA at least once.

Section B. - The Radio Diary Sample

Since the sample for the diary study was drawn according to a precise random method, the selection of respondents was in no way influenced.

Work on drawing the radio diary sample in West Germany started with 2,000 addresses, and with 800 in West Berlin. After erroneous addresses were eliminated, 1,903 valid addresses in West Germany and 756 in West Berlin remained. The following chart gives an overall view of the losses up to the time of the execution of the preliminary interview.

Table 1

	<u>Shrinkage of the Original Addresses</u>			
	<u>West Germany</u>		<u>West Berlin</u>	
	<u>#</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>#</u>	<u>%</u>
<u>Number of valid addresses drawn</u>	1,903	100	756	100
Repeatedly not at home	168	9	63	8
Refused to give information or reply to questions	134	7	96	13
Other reasons (interviewee not in a position to grant an interview, interviewer ill, etc.)	56	3	6	1
<u>Number of actual preliminary interviews</u>	1,545	81	591	78

The results here are in keeping with past experience in that in Berlin the mortality is generally higher than in the Federal Republic. This is due on the one hand to the metropolitan character of Berlin (i.e. people have more out-of-the-home interests) and on the other hand to the peculiar position of Berlin in the political arena. Many refusals were not directed against the survey as such, but were caused by a general distrust against strangers at the door.

The rate of shrinkage (19%) of the addresses drawn in West Germany is a trifle higher than the average loss common to representative inquiries, while remaining within customary limits. However, exhaustive inquiries (by the DIVO sample section) have shown that no essential distortions of the sample occurred.

In the preliminary interviews it was established whether the interviewees were radio listeners or not. It was found that 183 interviewees in West Germany and 28 interviewees in West Berlin could not be considered radio listeners, that is to say, they did not listen in their own home or in another home of the same house. They did not therefore meet the requirements laid down in the study and were accordingly eliminated. Thus, 1,362 radio listeners in West Germany and 563 in West Berlin were eligible to keep a radio diary since they were "radio listeners." The following chart shows the further mortality.

Table 2

Mortality of the Radio Diary Sample

	<u>West Germany</u>		<u>West Berlin</u>	
	<u>#</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>#</u>	<u>%</u>
Eligible to keep diary (i.e. radio listeners)	1,362	100	563	100
Declined to accept radio diary	143	10	23	4
Accepted diary but did not fill it in	94	7	42	8
Number of diaries filled in =	1,125	83	498	88

For this consideration we have intentionally by-passed non-listeners because they, by reason of the definition given above, were not included in the study.

We have indicated that in West Germany, of all contacted persons (i.e. those 1,545 cases with whom a preliminary interview was made), 1,362 were radio listeners and 183 were non-listeners. Thus, 12% of the contact persons were found to be non-radio listeners.

It can be assumed, although there is no material to confirm the assumption that the distribution of non-radio listeners would be the same in the originally drawn sample. Hence 12 per cent of the 1903 valid addresses is 228. We may assume therefore that there were 228 non-radio-listeners and 1,675 listeners in the original sample. A total of 1,125 interviewees finally filled in the diary, while 550 of the estimated total number of radio listeners dropped out. Thus, there is a 33 per cent loss from the group estimated to be originally eligible.

In West Berlin, 28 of the 591 persons contacted proved to be non-radio-listeners which is 5 per cent of the total. Applying the same figure to the original figure of 756 addresses would indicate 718 should have been radio listeners. Inasmuch, as 498 persons actually filled in a diary, we arrive at a loss of 31 per cent.

Consequently, in West Berlin just as in West Germany, approximately one-third of the persons who might be presumed to be eligible did not fill in the diary. Previous studies comparing the characteristics of radio listeners with those of the total population above 18 years of age have repeatedly revealed no substantial deviations. From the table below it can be seen that we are confronted with only very negligible differences when we compare the composition of the radio listeners contacted in the diary study, not with the composition of the sum total of radio listeners (as there are no official data available), but with a corresponding breakdown of the population according to current census data.*

Table 3
Composition of the Radio Diary Sample, West Germany

	<u>West Germany</u>	
	<u>Diary</u>	<u>Census</u>
	<u>keeper</u>	<u>data*</u>
<u>Demographic Characteristics</u>		
<u>Sex:</u>		
Men	45%	45%
Women	<u>55</u>	<u>55</u>
	100%	100%
<u>Age:</u>		
18 to 29 years	21%	25%
30 to 39 years	22	17
40 to 49 years	24	21
50 to 59 years	19	18
60 years and above	<u>14</u>	<u>19</u>
	100%	100%
<u>Religion:</u>		
Protestants	52%	51%
Catholics	44	45
Others/No religion	<u>4</u>	<u>4</u>
	100%	100%
<u>Family Status:</u>		
Single	19%	24%
Married	69	63
Widowed/Divorced	<u>12</u>	<u>13</u>
	100%	100%

(Cont'd on next page)

* According to latest data available from the BUREAU OF STATISTICS, German Federal Republic, Wiesbaden.

(Cont'd from preceding page)

		West Germany	
		<u>Diary</u> <u>keeper</u>	<u>Census</u> <u>data*</u>
<u>Demographic Characteristics</u>			
<u>City Size:</u>			
Up	to 1,999	27%	26%
	2,000 to 4,999	16	13
	5,000 to 24,999	13	} 25
	25,000 to 49,999	7	
	50,000 to 99,999	5	6
	100,000 and more	32	30
		<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>
<u>Land:</u>			
	Schleswig/Holstein	5%	5%
	Hamburg	4	4
	Lower Saxony	15	13
	Bremen	1	1
	North Rhine/Westphalia	30	29
	Hesse	11	9
	Rhineland/Palatinate	4	7
	Baden/Wuerttemberg	13	14
	Bavaria	17	18
		<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>

* According to latest data available from the BUREAU OF STATISTICS, German Federal Republic, Wiesbaden.

While only relatively small deviations in the percentages were observed for West Germany, even smaller differences are revealed by a corresponding consideration of the data found in West Berlin. Here the largest deviation only amounts to 3 per cent. Closer correspondence of the characteristics of diary keepers in West Berlin with those of the population there is to be expected (over similar data in West Germany) since 95 per cent of the population in West Berlin are known to be radio listeners as against 88 per cent in West Germany.

Table 4
Composition of the Radio Diary Sample, West Berlin

	<u>West Berlin</u>	
	<u>Diary</u> <u>keeper</u>	<u>Census</u> <u>data*</u>
<u>Demographic Characteristics</u>		
<u>Sex:</u>		
Men	40%	41%
Women	60	59
	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>
<u>Age:</u>		
18 to 29 years	18%	17%
30 to 39 years	13	13
40 to 49 years	20	22
50 to 59 years	23	22
60 years and above	26	26
	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>
<u>Religion:</u>		
Protestants	71%	73%
Catholics	14	11
Others/No religion	15	16
	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>
<u>Family Status:</u>		
Single	18%	20%
Married	60	60
Widowed/Divorced	22	20
	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>

The comparisons presented above constitute no more than some clues supporting the contention that our samples are representative. Accordance between the distribution of the demographic groups in the sample and among the total population increases the probability that the sample is representative in regard to other characteristics as well. Only in this sense do we affirm that our samples, reveal good representation with respect to the characteristics examined.

* According to latest data available from the BUREAU of STATISTICS, German Federal Republic, Wiesbaden.

Chapter 2: The Coincidental Interview Study

Section A. - General Description

While the diary method served the purpose of gaining insight into listener habits during a one-week period, the coincidental interview method was directed at a very definite and smaller time period, during which listener habits were to be controlled directly by the interviewer himself. In the study under discussion here, the coincidental interview was applied for the purpose of investigating listener habits during the time when the Voice of America programs were broadcast.

The Voice of America programs were broadcast in West Germany and in West Berlin every week day from 18:45 to 19:00 hours, over the stations of the Bavarian Broadcasting System, Hessian Broadcasting System, South German Radio, Radio Bremen, and RIAS. In West Berlin, the VOA programs were also broadcast over various wave lengths at other times of the day. Nevertheless for the purposes of administrative simplicity in Berlin as well the study was restricted to the time from 18:45 to 19:00 hours.

The scheduling of the interview at a definite hour entails a number of special difficulties in addition to the usual problems pertinent to sampling and field work. The following principal questions arise: 1. How can sufficiently numerous interviews be conducted during the designated time period? 2. How can the representativeness of this sample be preserved if call backs are rendered impossible by the time limitation?

Theoretically it would be desirable to have the individuals comprising the coincidental interview sample also selected according to strict random probability. While there was no question of its desirability, prior estimates of what this would entail had to be calculated in order to determine its practicability. Entering into the consideration were the following estimates for West Germany: a) because of normal mortality in interviewing no more than 85% of those sought can be reached, b) among those finally reached 88% may be expected to be radio listeners, and c) of those who are radio listeners only about 30% may be expected to be listening to the radio at 18:45 hours. All of these estimates, naturally are based upon past survey results.

In order to make later analyses of the radio listeners, it was deemed imperative that a minimum of 100 listeners be secured for each day. Applying the above estimates to the end goal of 100 radio listeners, we find that it would be necessary to attempt to interview a minimum of 445 people simultaneously at 18:45 hours each day of the week. Naturally for such a task, it would be necessary to have an interviewer staff of at least 445 interviewers ready to ring that many doorbells throughout the Federal Republic at the required time (18:45 hours). Needless to say, no presently existing German research institute could carry out such an assignment.

Having thus determined the impracticability of the theoretically desirable procedure, it was necessary to select a feasible yet random procedure. Since strict random selection of individuals was out, next consideration was given to the random selection of households when no substitutions would be permitted. It could only be roughly estimated that an average of 25 out of every 100 scheduled households might fulfill the requirement of having a radio which was listened to during the test period. Accordingly 400 addresses per day would be needed, in order to make interviews at 100 radio listening households. Since a random distribution of such households throughout the country prevents an interviewer from visiting two target households within the quarter hour if substitutions were not to be permitted, 400 interviewers per day would have to be employed to make these contacts within the designated quarter hour.

In order to cope with this problem the following procedure was adopted: A goal of 600 interviews with radio listening households in West Germany and 400 in West Berlin was planned. Following the usual DIVO systematic random sample procedures 600 names of households (plus 400 in West Berlin) were drawn from the files of the municipal registries in the communities selected as sampling points by random procedures. The total number of interviews to be secured was distributed over the six weekdays of the test week. Every interviewer employed in the survey was given a total of six addresses and it was his task to conduct one interview on each week day.

* Statistically speaking, a minimum of 200 would be even better to give a really firm basis for calculations of reliability of the obtained percentages.

The interviewers were under instruction to visit the target household at 18:45 hours on the weekday scheduled. If no one responded or information was refused, the interviewer was instructed to visit another household in the vicinity, according to a fixed plan* until he found a household which met the requirements of the survey. An interview was made only in such households where the radio was actually in use. Thus the interviewer also passed up households, without making an interview, where nobody was listening to the radio.

In households where the radio was listened to, the interviewer listed all persons listening at the time of his visit, and from them he selected the person to be interviewed according to a system of random numbers, given to him in advance.

Section B. - The Coincidental Interview Sample

The 600 addresses used in West Germany and the 400 used in West Berlin were drawn from the files of the municipal registry of inhabitants of the sample communities previously designated. In many instances, when no interview could be made at the target household, the interviewer had to visit several substitute households until he found a household in which the radio was listened to. In this manner a total of 1,837 households were visited in West Germany, and 1,592 households in West Berlin. These figures must be kept in mind in order to understand the derivation of the sample under discussion.

* The interviewer was then under instruction to try visiting the household directly opposite the original one on the same floor. If there was no household opposite the target one, the interviewer had to proceed to the right of the original household. Should that not prove possible he was to go to the same locality as the target household on the floor above, and if then still necessary, the similar household on the floor below was to be tried.

The following chart shows the distribution of contact attempts broken down into individual categories.

Table 5
Contact attempts in the coincidental survey

	<u>West Germany</u>		<u>West Berlin</u>	
	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>
Contact attempts	1.837	100	1.592	100
No one at home	330	18	511	32
Information refused	70	4	189	12
No radio	135	7	65	4
Radio not listened to	694	38	492	31
Interviews carried out	608	33	335	21

In West Berlin 335 interviews were completed out of 400 originally drawn addresses. In 65 instances, it was not possible for the interviewer to find a proper substitute household during the time 18:45 to 19:00 hours. In West Germany such mortality as occurred was compensated for by the fact that some of the interviewers, during the test quarter hour, conducted interviews in two substitute households.*

Table 6 on the following page provides a summary of the distribution of contact attempts over the various work days. The distribution is essential for the control of the sample, since the inquiries on the various days must be looked upon as sub-samples. A prerequisite for the validity of the sample as a whole is an equal distribution of the coincidental interviews over the various weekdays.

* This was not originally planned; however, since there were so few additional cases it was felt that there was no danger of a distortion of the sample, and these additional cases were also evaluated.

Table 6

Daily Distribution of Coincidental Contacts

		<u>West Germany</u>						
		<u>Monday</u>	<u>Tuesday</u>	<u>Wednesday</u>	<u>Thursday</u>	<u>Friday</u>	<u>Saturday</u>	<u>Total</u>
Total contacts		325	295	364	342	260	251	1837
No one at home		65	54	65	62	48	36	330
Information refused		7	17	15	14	8	9	70
No radio		20	25	27	23	18	22	135
Radio not listened to		128	95	143	133	100	95	694
Number of radio listeners reached		105	104	114	110	86	89	608
In % of total contacts		32	35	31	32	33	36	33

		<u>West Berlin</u>						
		<u>Monday</u>	<u>Tuesday</u>	<u>Wednesday</u>	<u>Thursday</u>	<u>Friday</u>	<u>Saturday</u>	<u>Total</u>
Total contacts		217	314	247	315	281	218	1592
No one at home		66	94	66	115	98	72	511
Information refused		24	43	31	36	27	28	189
No radio		9	7	9	21	10	9	65
Radio not listened to		61	111	81	88	94	57	492
Number of radio listeners reached		57	59	60	55	52	52	335
In % of total contacts		26	19	24	17	18	24	21

Here we sum up the number of completed interviews for each day of the week.

Table 7
Distribution of the coincidental interviews
over the test week

<u>Weekdays</u>	<u>Number of Interviews</u>			
	<u>West Germany</u>		<u>West Berlin</u>	
	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>
Monday	105	17	57	17
Tuesday	104	17	59	18
Wednesday	114	19	60	18
Thursday	110	18	55	16
Friday	86	14	52	16
Saturday	89	15	52	15
	<u>608</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>335</u>	<u>100</u>

The fluctuations in the distribution of the interviews over the various weekdays must be regarded as negligible.

Let us consider once more the procedure of the contact effort up to the final execution of the interview. In West Germany 33 interviews out of every 100 contact attempts were carried out. In West Berlin, the result was 21 interviews made out of every 100 contact efforts.

Households of non-radio listeners are without interest, according to the design of the study. Our observations will be more accurate if we only consider the radio listener data. From the preliminary interview for the diary survey and from earlier studies, we know that 88% of the adult population in West Germany and 95% of West Berlin are radio listeners.

Assuming that these percentages also apply to households, by multiplying the 1,837 contact attempts in West Germany by 88% we arrive at a figure of 1,617 attempted contacts with radio listeners in West Germany, and a corresponding figure of 1,512 contact attempts with radio listeners in West Berlin (95% of 1,592). Since 608 successful interviews were made with radio listeners in West Germany and 335 in West Berlin, by applying these figures to the estimated 1,617 and 1,512 attempted contacts, it develops that for each 100 contact attempts with radio listeners in West Germany 38 were concluded in West Germany while 22 were concluded in West Berlin.

In order to judge the mortality occurring in connection with the coincidental technique, the goal of the inquiry must be remembered; i.e. during the program time of the "Voice of America" the most accurate check of listener habits possible was desired. In contrast to other surveys, therefore, not all of those instances when no one could be contacted must be counted as mortality. To find no one home during the test quarter hour tells us that the radio was not listened to during that period.

We have no information, however, for the instances in which information was refused. We do not know whether the refusers were radio listeners or non-listeners, nor do we know whether the radio listeners in this group listened to the radio during the test quarter hour. We can only assume that 12 per cent and 5 per cent in West Germany and in West Berlin respectively, of those not cooperating are non-listeners and that they would automatically have dropped out of the survey even if we had information. If we tally the estimates on this basis, we will arrive at a figures of 62 cases in which information was refused by radio listeners in West Germany and a corresponding number of 180 cases in West Berlin.

The number of cases in which no information was available for radio listeners concerning their listening habits during the test quarter hour is relatively small (on the basis of our estimate 4 per cent of the radio listeners contacted in West Germany and 12 per cent in West Berlin). The method is successful if considered from this aspect. It is another matter if we concentrate on the representativeness. If the inquiry had remained confined to the originally drawn addresses, the number of cases in the final sample would have been too small to draw dependable conclusions about the listening habits during the test quarter hour. Careful study of the concluded interviews revealed that in West Germany 207 out of the original 600 addresses were carried out (hence 35%) while in West Berlin only 71 out of the original 400 addresses were obtained (18%). Yet, the number of original addresses earmarked cannot be increased because none of the existing field organizations can manage to muster a sufficiently large number of interviewers in the limited time period of a quarter hour. There remains only the method of substitute households. In the survey here under discussion it was necessary to look up two or three substitute households for every case scheduled. Consequently, such an enormous number of contact attempts and ultimate interviews with substitute households becomes necessary, that the representativeness of the final sample can be seriously distorted.

Having carried out the coincidental survey interviewing, we have calculated that 38 interviews were obtained out of 100 households (of radio listeners) contacted in West Germany. In the diary survey, which was based on persons, it was found that an average of 22 out of 100 radio listeners (diary keepers) listened during the test time. If we had had these figures available before the project started as a basis for the estimated number of contacts required in the coincidental study, we would have known that actually some 720 addresses (and interviewers) would have been required in order to obtain a strictly random sample of 100 radio listeners* (listening during the test period). The pre-study conclusion that the execution of a strictly random sample of radio listeners would fall far beyond the limits of practicability has been substantiated.

* Calculation of the number of addresses required is based upon the findings of 38 completed interviews per 100 radio households and 22 completed diaries out of 100 radio listeners. Since the first figure (based on households) is 1.8 times that of the second (based on listeners), this same factor (namely 1.8) applied to the estimated 400 household that would be required to have 100 in the final sample results in an estimated 720 addresses that would be required.

Part II - Comparison
of the Diary and the Coincidental Method

Section A. - General Considerations

Before contrasting the data obtained from both surveys, a number of considerations are necessary. Above all, it is necessary to define the limits within which a comparison can be made.

The diary survey is based on a sample of radio listeners over 18 years of age. According to the diary entries, statements can be made about listening habits on the specific days of the test week as well as listening habits during the entire test week. We can therefore establish how many of the interviewees listened to the radio during the test week, how often they listened, to which stations they had tuned in, etc. We can also ascertain how many of the interviewees listened to the radio on a definite day at a definite time.

The coincidental survey, quite differently, concentrated on those radio listeners who listened to the radio between 18:45 and 19:00 hours. More correctly stated, we should say: In the coincidental survey we deal with six samples, of which each one refers to those listeners who on a given week-day listen to the radio during the time from 18:45 to 19:00 hours. From the coincidental survey, therefore, we receive direct information only about the listening habits of the interviewees on a definite day for the time between 18:45 and 19:00 hours. An inspection of the six samples side by side gives us an overall view of the test periods of the week.

Therefore, what are the consequences for the comparison we have in mind? It follows that a comparison seems possible, in spite of the diversity in method, if the comparison is narrowed down to the time between 18:45 and 19:00 hours on the individual week-days. Data for this time period taken from the coincidental and from the diary survey are available. In each instance, we can contrast the data from the various samples of the coincidental survey with the corresponding data from the diary survey, considering the diary sample by itself as a panel for each week-day. This will suffice as a general introduction. Further factors will be discussed as various efforts at comparison are made.

Section B. - Comparisons of Obtained Data

1) Listeners and Non-Listeners

As we have seen in the preceding section, the coincidental survey allows us to deduce in how many contact households the radio was listened to during the test quarter hour, and in how many it was not. Thus, at first glance, a comparison suggests itself with the proportion found in the diary survey between listeners and non-listeners during the test quarter hour. In examining the two sets of data, it must be remembered that, as previously shown, each comes from a different type of sample. Therefore, in contrasting these two sets of results the deviations reflect the different procedures and remind us to exercise caution when interpreting those variations.

Table 8 and 8a on the following pages give a summary of the percentages of listeners and non-listeners on the various week-days. The data of the coincidental survey again refer to the estimated numbers of contacts with households of radio listeners.* The figures of the diary survey refer to those persons who filled in the diary.

* As calculated on page 11 (i.e. 1,617 for West Germany and 1,512 for West Berlin).

Table 8

Listeners and Non-Listeners During the Test Period - West Germany

	<u>Diary</u>													
	<u>Monday</u>		<u>Tuesday</u>		<u>Wednesday</u>		<u>Thursday</u>		<u>Friday</u>		<u>Saturday</u>		<u>Average</u>	
	<u>#</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>#</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>#</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>#</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>#</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>#</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>#</u>	<u>%</u>
Listened to radio	284	25	280	25	246	22	252	22	234	21	215	19	252	22
Did not listen to radio	<u>841</u>	<u>75</u>	<u>845</u>	<u>75</u>	<u>879</u>	<u>78</u>	<u>873</u>	<u>78</u>	<u>891</u>	<u>79</u>	<u>910</u>	<u>81</u>	<u>873</u>	<u>78</u>
<u>Number of diary-keepers</u>	1125	100	1125	100	1125	100	1125	100	1125	100	1125	100	1125	100

Coincidental

	<u>Monday</u>		<u>Tuesday</u>		<u>Wednesday</u>		<u>Thursday</u>		<u>Friday</u>		<u>Saturday</u>		<u>Average</u>	
	<u>#</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>#</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>#</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>#</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>#</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>#</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>#</u>	<u>%</u>
Listened to radio	105	37	104	40	114	36	110	37	86	38	89	40	101	38
Did not listen to radio*	<u>181</u>	<u>63</u>	<u>156</u>	<u>60</u>	<u>206</u>	<u>64</u>	<u>191</u>	<u>63</u>	<u>143</u>	<u>62</u>	<u>132</u>	<u>60</u>	<u>168</u>	<u>62</u>
<u>Estimated number of contacts with radio listeners**</u>	286	100	260	100	320	100	301	100	229	100	221	100	269	100

* Estimated number of contacts with radio listeners minus number of listeners during test period.
 ** 88% of total number of contacts.

Table 8a

Listeners and Non-Listeners During the Test Period - West Berlin

	Diary													
	Monday		Tuesday		Wednesday		Thursday		Friday		Saturday		Average	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Listened to radio	108	22	91	18	89	18	104	20	122	24	85	17	1120	20
Did not listen to radio	390	78	407	82	409	82	394	80	376	76	413	83	398	80
Number of diary-keepers	498	100	498	100	498	100	498	100	498	100	498	100	498	100

Coincidental

	Monday		Tuesday		Wednesday		Thursday		Friday		Saturday		Average	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Listened to radio	57	28	59	20	60	26	55	18	52	20	52	25	56	22
Did not listen to radio	149	72	239	80	175	74	244	82	210	80	155	75	195	78
Estimated number of contacts with radio listeners**	206	100	298	100	235	100	299	100	262	100	207	100	251	100

* Estimated number of contacts with radio listeners minus number of listeners during test period.
 ** 95% of total number of contacts.

Considerable fluctuations between the individual week-days are not revealed in either survey. The percentage of cases in which the radio was listened to during the test quarter hour is, however, generally higher in the coincidental survey than in the diary survey. Here are the weekly average percentages.

Table 9
Percentages of Listeners and Non-Listeners
(weekly average)

	<u>West Germany</u>		<u>West Berlin</u>	
	<u>Diary</u>	<u>Coin-</u> <u>cidental</u>	<u>Diary</u>	<u>Coin-</u> <u>cidental</u>
Listened to the radio	22%	38%	20%	22%
Did not listen to the radio	<u>78</u>	<u>62</u>	<u>80</u>	<u>78</u>
<u>Total</u>	100%	100%	100%	100%

The higher percentage of listeners found in the coincidental survey may be attributable in part to factors which are likely to occur in this technique. One possibility would be "interviewer bias." It places very high demands on the integrity of the interviewer. It is in the interviewer's interest to succeed in concluding an interview as quickly as possible, that is, to find a household where the radio is being listened to. This might induce him to deviate from the prescribed plan when the selection of a substitute household is made. A control of the interviewer is possible, of course, although very complicated. However, on the basis of spot checks and considering the training and the standard of the interviewer staff employed, this influence must be regarded as small.

Still another possible source of error remains. It is possible, for example, that in a given household the radio is tuned in, but that no one is consciously listening to it. The interviewer can check whether the radio is tuned in or not, but he has to depend on the statements of the interviewees whether someone in the household actually listened to the radio or not. Likewise the interview may not take place in the room in which the radio is playing. In such a case the interviewer must rely on the interviewees' statements about the programs and stations heard.

While these error possibilities exist, the divergency must fundamentally be considered the result of the fact that the data of the coincidental survey do not constitute a representative selection of radio listeners as in the case of the diary method, but a selection of households. Every household in which the radio was listened to had an equal chance to enter the sample, regardless of whether only one member of the household or several members were listening to the radio at the time of the interview. By contrast, the persons actually questioned did not have an equal chance. The probability of being questioned was dependent on the number of persons who at the time of the visit were listening to the radio. In each household selected, only one person was interviewed. Since this very method of selection is an integral part of the coincidental technique here employed, it cannot be considered an "error", but simply a result of the differences in method. It follows, therefore, that with regard to the proportion of listeners and non-listeners during the test quarter hour, a direct comparison is not possible.

What follows from these considerations? With regard to the coincidental method, therefore, we must qualify our previous statement; the coincidental survey does not provide comparable information (with the diary) about listener habits at a given time. Information concerning whether or not the radio was listened to during the test quarter hour is not representative of "radio listeners" but (if at all) for "Households with radio listeners."

2) Listeners During the Test Quarter Hour

Another possible comparison of the data derived from the two methods under discussion would concern listeners during the test quarter hour. Before the listeners included in the two surveys are compared, some preliminary observations again become necessary. It must be determined whether it is possible to combine the listeners included in the 6 sub-samples of the coincidental survey and then contrast them with the listeners of the test quarter hour contained in the radio diary survey, inasmuch as the chance to be included in the body of listeners may not be the same in both studies.

A person keeping the diary, who during the test week listened to the radio only once within the test (VOA) quarter hour, appears among the total number of VOA listeners for that week just as well as the person keeping a diary who listened to the VOA every day. In the coincidental survey, a household in which, at the test period, the radio is listened to only once within the week, has only one 6th the chance of being included among the listeners for the week as has a household in which the radio is listened to everyday (6 times). In view of the possibility that radio listeners who listen 6 times a week during the test quarter hour may be differentiated in other listening habits from the group listening only once during the test quarter hour, a weighting becomes necessary before a summary can be made of the two listener groups in contrast to each other.

Weighting is not necessary where consideration is not focused on the whole week but on individual days. The person who, for example, in the coincidental survey listened on Monday during the test quarter hour would have had an equal chance of being included in the sample if he were in the diary survey. The same holds true for the other week days (always keeping in mind that in the case of the coincidental study we are concerned with households and that in the case of the diary study we are concerned with persons). It is even possible to obtain an overall view of the total number of listeners of the week without any weighting, if in this overall view we refer to the averages for the week.*

However, the procedure of weighting in the present case can be exceedingly simple. It is possible to base data in the diary survey not on individuals, but on quarter hour listening periods and by this means we can carry out the necessary weighting. The listener who during the week has listened to the radio once between 18:45 and 19:00 hours is credited with one quarter hour. The listener who has listened 6 times is credited with 6 quarter hours. With this device, a ratio of 6 to 1 has been established, and the necessary adjustments are made to afford radio diary listeners (between 18:45 and 19:00 hours) the same chances as hold true in the coincidental survey.

* For example, see figures for weekly average in tables 8 and 8a, pages 18 and 19.

Following this procedure, a sum total of 1,511 quarter hours heard in West Germany and a corresponding figures of 599 in West Berlin is derived for the radio diary keepers.

Table 10

	<u>Radio Diary</u>			
	<u>West Germany</u>		<u>West Berlin</u>	
	<u>No. of cases</u>	<u>Quarter hours heard</u>	<u>No. of cases</u>	<u>Quarter hours heard</u>
Listened one day	204	204	101	101
Listened 2 days	102	204	82	164
Listened 3 days	85	255	44	132
Listened 4 days	78	312	24	96
Listened 5 days	52	260	14	70
Listened 6 days	<u>46</u>	<u>276</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>36</u>
<u>Sum Total</u>	1125	1511	498	599

The subsequent table shows the composition of listeners during the test quarter hours. Utilizing the total number of quarter hours (1511 and 599 for diary listeners in West Germany and West Berlin and 608 and 335 for coincidental survey listeners in the two areas) as a base figure of 100, the figures indicate what proportions were listened to by persons belonging to the different categories.

Table 11

Composition of the Listeners in the Diary and in the Coincidental Survey (Weighted)

	<u>West Germany</u>		<u>West Berlin</u>	
	<u>Diary</u>	<u>Coincidental</u>	<u>Diary</u>	<u>Coincidental</u>
Male	46%	48%	41%	47%
Female	<u>54</u> 100%	<u>52</u> 100%	<u>59</u> 100%	<u>53</u> 100%
18 to 29 years	22%	22%	16%	16%
30 to 39 years	21	21	11	13
40 to 49 years	21	22	18	25
50 to 59 years	19	19	23	18
60 to 69 years	<u>17</u> 100%	<u>16</u> 100%	<u>32</u> 100%	<u>28</u> 100%
Resident	70%	77%	84%	85%
Non-resident	<u>30</u> 100%	<u>23</u> 100%	<u>16</u> 100%	<u>15</u> 100%
Catholics	41%	43%	16%	10%
Protestants	56	53	71	75
Others/None	<u>3</u> 100%	<u>4</u> 100%	<u>13</u> 100%	<u>15</u> 100%
<u>Number of quarter hour periods of listening</u>	(1511)	(608)	(599)	(335)

The table reveals a rather pronounced similarity of the percentages. In view of the purpose of the study, however, we have to keep in mind that the composition of the listeners is of relatively minor importance in contrast to their listening habits.

3) Radio Stations Heard

By way of recapitulation it may be said: We have so far investigated whether the proportions of listeners and non-listeners of the test quarter hour obtained through the two surveys can be compared. We arrived at the conclusion that a strict comparison of the proportions of listeners and non-listeners during the test period is not possible because of the diversity in the selection methods. When, in the preceding section, a comparison of the weighted composition of the listeners was made, we found considerable agreement between the proportions. However reassuring these similarities are, they do not yet tell us anything about the data which are the very objective of the study, namely the listening habits of the interviewees. Therefore the question arises - "What do both methods yield about the radio stations tuned in during the test quarter hour and about programs that were being listened to?"

In the following table the figures again refer to the quarter hour periods of listening:

Table 12

	<u>Stations Tuned in During Test Period</u>							
	<u>West Germany</u>				<u>West Berlin</u>			
	<u>Diary</u>		<u>Coin-</u>		<u>Diary</u>		<u>Coin-</u>	
	<u>#</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>#</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>#</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>#</u>	<u>%</u>
NWDR	944	62	242	40	5	1	2	1
Munich	198	13	103	17	-	-	-	-
Stuttgart	126	8	71	12	-	-	-	-
Sued/West-Funk	116	8	91	15	-	-	2	1
Frankfurt	86	6	47	8	-	-	1	*
Bremen	22	2	9	1	-	-	-	-
RIAS	1	*	2	*	331	55	169	50
SFB	-	-	-	-	240	40	132	39
Others	18	1	43	7	23	4	29	9
<u>Quarter hour periods</u> <u>of listening</u>	1511	100	608	100	599	100	335	100

While in West Berlin we find fairly close agreement between the percentages from the diary and coincidental samples, the divergencies in West Germany are considerable.

* Less than one half of one per cent.

In West Germany the radio stations are ranked in the same order with one exception. According to the coincidental survey, Sued/West-Funk is heard more often than Stuttgart. While the rankings tend to agree, there are sizeable differences with respect to the percentages. In the case of NWDR the divergency amounts to 22 per cent. What are the causes for this divergency?

Studying the composition of the samples, a partial explanation can be found in the Laender distributions. The percentages of the population in those Laender in which NWDR is predominantly listened to (Schleswig/Holstein, Hamburg, Lower Saxony, Bremen, and North Rhine/Westphalia) amounts to 52 per cent. The corresponding percentage of these Laender in the Diary Survey stands at 55 per cent. The deviation as compared with the total population amounts to only 3 per cent. In the Coincidental Survey the percentage stands at 46 per cent, and the deviation as compared with the total population amounts to 6 per cent - but in the opposite direction.

If we now contrast the proportions of the two samples with each other we find a total discrepancy of 9 per cent. Doubtlessly this difference had an effect on the percentages of the radio stations reported listened to.

This alone, however, cannot sufficiently explain the divergency found. Other factors must have entered the picture.

In the case of the radio diary it is possible that programs were erroneously listed, or that some listening was completely forgotten. Since these very error possibilities were contemplated in advance, everything was done to reduce them as much as possible. The interviewee not only was given the benefit of oral instructions, but he also found all important instructions repeated on the first page of the diary. In addition to this, in every single case, the whole diary was discussed once more at the end of the week and was closely examined by the interviewer in the presence of the interviewee. The interviewer thus gained an impression of the reliability of the listings and of the attitude of the interviewee to the whole procedure. The reports handed in by the interviewers concerning their experiences, with few exceptions, contain favorable comments on the willingness of the interviewees to cooperate and the reliability of their listings. In order to assure further means of control, every single sheet was carefully examined once more by the evaluation staff. They, too, confirmed that the listings had been very carefully and thoroughly filled in.

We must now consider the difference between the methods. The diary holder is urged to list all programs to which he had listened. Consequently, it may be that in many cases the radio had been tuned in, but the diary holder did not actually, i.e. consciously, listen and that he, therefore, did not make an entry. It is true that when the coincidental method is employed, the interviewer can establish whether the radio was tuned in, but he cannot in each case safely ascertain whether the radio program playing when he arrived was consciously listened to, and hence whether there would have been conscious listening to the particular program if he had not focused their attention upon it. No final explanation can be given here, but perhaps the basis for the divergencies lies with one of the possibilities mentioned.

4) VOA and Non-VOA-Listeners

Another comparison to be presented here concentrated on a breakdown of listeners to the VOA and listeners to other radio stations during the test quarter hour.

The following table is also based upon the number of quarter hour periods of listening during the test week. The figures for Wednesday in West Berlin had to be omitted from this comparison because on the day of the coincidental survey the Bundestag debate was broadcast over one RIAS wave band instead of the usual program, thereby rendering the obtained data atypical. Saturday had to be omitted as well because RIAS does not relay the VOA program on this day.

Table 13

	<u>Radio Listening During the Test Periods</u>							
	<u>West Germany</u>				<u>West Berlin</u>			
	<u>Diary</u>		<u>Coin-</u>		<u>Diary</u>		<u>Coin-</u>	
	<u>#</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>#</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>#</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>#</u>	<u>%</u>
Listeners to VOA	153	10	131	22	209	49	96	43
Listeners to other programs	<u>1358</u>	<u>90</u>	<u>477</u>	<u>78</u>	<u>216</u>	<u>51</u>	<u>127</u>	<u>57</u>
<u>Total</u>	1511	100	608	100	425	100	223	100

Again it should be noted that the divergencies in the data for West Berlin are less pronounced than those in West Germany. This present comparison reveals a difference of only 6 per cent for West Berlin, while the difference for West Germany amounts to 12 per cent.

In order to learn whether this divergency can be due to any particular day, the proportion of VOA listeners and listeners to other radio stations for each day have been calculated. The data are presented in Table 14 on the following page and compares the data obtained through the coincidental method with those of the diary survey.

It is apparent that divergencies occur in each of the workdays with only slight fluctuations. The fluctuations are a little more pronounced for West Berlin and may only reflect the instability inherent in the relatively few cases.

There can be no doubt but that the deviation between coincidental and radio diary figures in West Germany concerning the proportion of VOA listeners is connected with the deviation found in respect to the stations heard. This latter deviation in turn was traced back to a difference in sample distribution by Laender. It was pointed out that the coincidental sample had 9 per cent more people in the former American Zone Laender, than was found to be the case in the diary sample. Since only stations in the former American Zone broadcast the "Voice of America", it appears that the 12 per cent difference in the VOA listening for West Germany can, to a large degree, be accounted for by this same difference in sample distribution.

In West Berlin, it would appear that the 5 per cent more found listening to RIAS in the diary sample than in the coincidental sample (see table on page 24) is responsible for the 6 per cent greater listening to VOA found here.

Table 14

West Germany

VOA's Share of the Total Broadcasts Heard - 18:45-19:00 Hours

Diary

	<u>Monday</u>		<u>Tuesday</u>		<u>Wednesday</u>		<u>Thursday</u>		<u>Friday</u>		<u>Saturday</u>		<u>Average</u>	
	<u>#</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>#</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>#</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>#</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>#</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>#</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>#</u>	<u>%</u>
VOA	23	8	28	10	29	12	28	11	20	9	25	12	153	10
Others	261	92	252	90	217	88	224	89	214	91	190	88	1358	90
<u>Total broadcasts heard</u>	284	100	280	100	246	100	252	100	234	100	215	100	1511	100

Coincidental

	<u>Monday</u>		<u>Tuesday</u>		<u>Wednesday</u>		<u>Thursday</u>		<u>Friday</u>		<u>Saturday</u>		<u>Average</u>	
	<u>#</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>#</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>#</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>#</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>#</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>#</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>#</u>	<u>%</u>
VOA	18	17	24	23	26	23	26	24	18	21	19	21	131	22
Others	87	83	80	77	88	77	84	76	68	79	70	79	477	78
<u>Total broadcasts heard</u>	105	100	104	100	114	100	110	100	86	100	89	100	608	100

Broadcasts Heard:

Table 14a

West Berlin*

VOA's Share of the Total Broadcasts Heard - 18:45-19:00 Hours

	<u>Monday</u>		<u>Tuesday</u>		<u>Wednesday</u>		<u>Thursday</u>		<u>Friday</u>		<u>Saturday</u>		<u>Total</u>	
	<u>#</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>#</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>#</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>#</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>#</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>#</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>#</u>	<u>%</u>
VOA	59	55	46	51			52	50	52	43			209	49
Others	<u>49</u>	<u>45</u>	<u>45</u>	<u>49</u>			<u>52</u>	<u>50</u>	<u>70</u>	<u>57</u>			<u>216</u>	<u>51</u>
<u>Total Broadcasts Heard</u>	108	100	91	100			104	100	122	100			425	100

Coincidental

	<u>Monday</u>		<u>Tuesday</u>		<u>Wednesday</u>		<u>Thursday</u>		<u>Friday</u>		<u>Saturday</u>		<u>Total</u>	
	<u>#</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>#</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>#</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>#</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>#</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>#</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>#</u>	<u>%</u>
VOA	24	42	28	47			21	38	23	44			96	43
Others	<u>33</u>	<u>58</u>	<u>31</u>	<u>53</u>			<u>34</u>	<u>62</u>	<u>29</u>	<u>56</u>			<u>127</u>	<u>57</u>
<u>Total Broadcasts Heard</u>	57	100	59	100			55	100	52	100			223	100

* On Wednesday, RIAS broadcasted over medium wave a debate of the German Bundestag. There are no VOA broadcasts by RIAS on Saturdays.

5) Conscious VOA Listening

It has already been stressed that the coincidental method often requires the interviewer to rely solely on the particulars supplied by the interviewees. It is not impossible that these particulars are less reliable than the listings in the diary. As we know RIAS never relayed any VOA programs during the test quarter hour on Saturdays. A check of the diary material shows that all listings of the West Berliners mention other programs. In the coincidental material, however, we find six cases listed as though the interviewee had listened to VOA during the test quarter hour on Saturday. A check-up showed that in all six of the cases RIAS had been cited as the radio station over which the VOA listening was supposed to have occurred. Since a total of 52 interviews was made in Berlin on Saturday, these six cases constitute a respondent error of 12%.

This erroneous information can be explained if we assume that in many households the radio was tuned in but was not actually listened to. Since nobody was consciously listening to the program tuned in, confusion occurred when the interviewer made the attempt to identify the program upon the occasion of his visit.

If we accept the assumption, then it should be possible to find more pronounced agreement concerning programs when conscious listening occurs than when we must rely on unverifiable interviewee information. Unfortunately, we find no possibility for a direct comparison. But we do have particulars from the interviewees in the coincidental survey as to whether they listened once or several times to the VOA during the week. Since this information is based on the memory of the interviewees, the programs presumably have been consciously heard. According to the assumption, the programs listed in the diary must also be regarded as programs consciously heard. We can now contrast the reported frequency of listening to VOA programs in the diary with data from the coincidental survey.

In West Germany, the VOA was only heard at 18:45 hours, therefore, the 153 cases from the diary and the 131 from the coincidental found to be VOA listeners (see Table 14) can be used as the basis for Table 15. In West Berlin, however, VOA programs are broadcast several times a day in addition to 18:45 hours. Consequently, since we wish to compare reported frequency of VOA listening, new bases must be computed which will include all VOA listeners in West Berlin. The totals of 447 and 123 (for West Berlin) reflect listeners to all VOA programs.

The percentages of 74% and 76% (in West Germany) and 83% and 84% (in West Berlin) are the replies of these people to the question, "How often do you listen to the VOA?" This question was asked of all VOA listeners found by either the radio diary or coincidental interview methods.

Table 15.

	<u>Listening to VOA</u> <u>Several times a week</u>	
	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Base</u>
West Germany		
Diary	74%	(153)
Coincidental	76	(131)
West Berlin		
Diary	83	(447)
Coincidental	84	(123)

The agreement between the percentages is a very close one in West Germany as well as in West Berlin. Thus it seems that the diary listings are in much closer agreement with the particulars concerning VOA listening habits furnished by the interviewees in the coincidental survey than with the general findings of the interviewees during the test quarter hour. This makes the assumption previously discussed (concerning conscious listening) much more probable. On the other hand, it must be stated that the comparison made here naturally does not in any way suffice to "prove" any assertions.

Section C.- Concluding Observations

The raison d'être of the two methods, the coincidental method and the radio diary method, is lodged in different bases. The diary method is thought to be the natural choice if the listening habits of radio listeners are to be traced over a long period of time. The coincidental method, on the other hand, is supposed to be the natural choice if information on listening habits is to be gathered only within a narrowly restricted time period. Since this technique is, from the very beginning, directed at persons who listen to the radio during the test period, the number of respondents is supposedly kept down to a smaller number.

But this holds true only if we discount the technical problems pertinent to the execution of the survey. In practical application, the coincidental technique requires so many more contact interviews and results in so many more difficulties than result from the diary technique that all supposed advantages of the coincidental survey are thereby overshadowed.

The mortality rate found for the diary method is somewhat higher than that found in straight survey interviewing. However, the representativeness of the sample can be much better guaranteed and also controlled than is the case with the coincidental survey.

The diary sample can be selected without any adjustments and carried out in much the same way as a normal population survey. The instructions which the interviewer has to observe are easy to understand. When, on the contrary, the coincidental survey is used, greater preparations become necessary. The limiting of the interview time to a quarter hour (or a similar period of time) places increased demands on the interviewer. Added to this is the difficulty of controlling the selection of substitute households - which must be allowed if sufficient cases are to be gathered in the required time period.

The coincidental survey theoretically has in its favor the supposed fact that more dependable information about listener habits can be gathered by the interviewer through a direct approach. With the diary method it is theoretically possible that listings may be forgotten or that false listings may occur. It is also claimed that listener habits are influenced by the keeping of a diary. But, as we have seen, the fact exists that false information is obtained through the coincidental method, too.

If one finally observes both methods from the viewpoint of economy, the fact emerges that with the diary method an abundance of information is obtained at relatively small unit cost, while the coincidental method yields only little data at relatively high cost. Only the greater reliability of the data could possibly justify the employment of the coincidental method. But, our experience shows that one must doubt that the information obtained by a coincidental survey which is supposed to have direct control of a definite time period is even as reliable as that obtained from a diary survey.

A P P E N D I X

(Radio Diary Instructions)

Useful Hints for Filling in the Radio Diary

We'd like to take this opportunity to again thank you cordially for kindly agreeing to take care of a radio diary for a week. Your cooperation, as well as the cooperation of roughly 2000 persons who live in all parts of West Germany and in West Berlin, enables us - a thing about which we are very happy - to compile very important data on the listening habits of the radio audience which will be significant for the planning of programs of all radio stations.

One thing is important: Please pursue your listening habits as usual during diary week, and just note down what programs you've heard.

That means that you must not let the radio diary upset your daily routine. If you feel like tuning in to the radio, go about it as you always do (note down what you heard), and if you are not in the mood for listening to the radio, let it go. Even if you do not get around to listening to the radio all week, this is just as valuable a fact for us as if you tune in every day. To catch all these natural fluctuations is one of the tasks of the radio diary. But it will be of use only if it reflects the normal behavior of the radio audience. Therefore, all entries have to be exact.

Please do not feel in any way obliged to listen to the radio more frequently than you usually do. For the idea is to get an accurate picture of what programs are being heard and which stations are tuned in, for this information is the basis for any kind of listener research. Studies designed to reveal the wishes of listeners are conducted separately.

Well, let's now turn to the filling in of the radio diary. Here's an example: A person arrives at his home after 18:00 hours on Monday and tunes in the radio a short time afterwards. He listens to the "Echo of the Day", the news program and the commentary of NWDR over the medium wave band, then he turns off the radio as he goes to supper. Shortly after 20:00 hours he turns on the radio once more, this time he tunes in to FM-North (a Franz Lehar program on the 19th of September, for instance) and listens until 21.30 hours. A little later - after a brief pause - he listens to the news program of NWDR broadcast over the medium wave band, then he turns in.

Entries would look like this: (Entries made on sample page)

If you are not sure over which wave length (meters) or frequency (kilocycles) a radio station broadcasts, please write down over which wave band - FM, short, medium or long - it can be tuned in; in the above model diary it was assumed that the person in question could not supply the wave length for the FM-radio station to which he had tuned in, but that he was quite sure about the name of the station: FM-North. Such a detail will also do.

Please observe the following two rule when filling in the diary:

- 1) If you listen to a program for at least five minutes of a 15-minute period, please note it down. If you listen less than 5 minutes, please do not make an entry.
- 2) If you change over from one program to another during a 15-minute period, note down only one program, that is, the one to which you listened longer.

It is self-understood that the results of the diary apply to you personally only, and not to other persons who may have assembled before the same radio set.

As shown in the model diary, please cross out those periods in all columns during which you did not listen to the radio.

If you happen to listen to the radio somewhere outside your home, please make the necessary entries - relying on your memory or using a note - just as if you had heard the program at home.

The radio diary is to be filled in in the week from October 3 to October 9, 1955. It will be collected by members of our staff between October 10 and October 16, 1955.

Thank you very much,



UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS-URBANA



3 0112 077849336

UNCLASSIFIED